REMARKS

Applicants have carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on April 11, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

The first paragraph of the application has been amended to reflect the proper serial numbers for the related applications.

Claims 1, 7, 14, and 21 are amended herein; as a result, claims 1-25 are now pending in this application. These claim amendments are consistent with the originally filed application. No new matter has been added.

'102 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 102(e) as being anticipated by Snyder (U.S. 6,381,519). It is fundamental that in order to sustain an anticipation rejection that each and every element in the rejected claims must be taught or disclosed in the cited reference. Here, Snyder fails to teach or disclose, either expressly or inherently, a cockpit display where the regions are surrounded by a bezel having integrated controls as is now recited in Applicants' amended claim 1.

More specifically, Snyder teaches only a presentation within a cockpit display. There is no suggestion or teaching in Snyder that would suggest that the display is surrounded by a bezel having integrated controls. Therefore, the rejection with respect to claims 1-6 is no longer sustainable and should be withdrawn.

Additionally, Applicants' note and disagree with the Examiner that Gordon teaches a bezel having integrated controls. Applicant cannot find any labels on Fig. 3 of the Gordon reference suggesting that any bezel, if present at all, includes integrated controls. There is no reference in Gordon to controls or a bezel and in Fig. 3, the unlabeled items which may represent some type of buttons are not mentioned anywhere in the specification. These unlabeled items are more likely to be power buttons and buttons affecting attributes of the display presentation, contrast, brightness, etc. and not controls for communication, navigation, or transponder settings.

Furthermore, none of the references cited by the Examiner show a control integrated within the bezel for transponder communication, which is conventionally located in an entirely

different location within the cockpit. Yet, Applicants' amended claim 1 now recites a bezel having an integrated transponder control.

Therefore, Applicants assert that not only is the anticipation rejection with respect to Snyder no longer appropriate, but that there is no obviousness rejection that can be made with respect to claims 1-6 based on the references of record. Correspondingly, Applicants request an indication of allowance with respect to claims 1-6.

'103(a) Rejection of the Claims

Claims 7-13, 21, 23, and 24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 103(a) as being obvious over Snyder in view of Gordon (U.S. 6,285,298). Claims 14-20 and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 103(a) as being obvious over Snyder in view of Bollard (U.S. 4,845,495). Claim 22 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. ' 103(a) as being obvious over Snyder in view of Devino (U.S. 4,598,292). To sustain an obviousness rejection each and every step or element in the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the cited references.

With respect to the rejections of claims 7-13, 21, 23, and 24 and as was noted above with respect to the remarks for claims 1-6, Applicants' do not believe that Gordon teaches or suggests a bezel having integrated controls. The Examiner's conclusion is based solely on Fig. 3 of Gordon. In that Fig. 3, there are no referenced labels that would support a conclusion that Gordon teaches a bezel having one or more controls affixed thereto. Moreover, there is no support or suggestion of support for this in the Gordon specification. Additionally, neither Gordon nor Snyder combined or in isolation suggest or teach a bezel having a transponder control. Thus, Applicants assert that the rejections with respect to claims 7-13, 21, 23, and 24 are not sustainable and should be withdrawn along with an indication of allowance with respect to these rejected claims.

With respect to the rejections of claims 14-20 and 25, Applicants note that Bollard teaches redundant displays that are not proximate or adjacent to one another as recited in Applicants' amended claim 14. More specifically, Bollard utilizes two entirely separate systems and displays, where one display is in the front of the cockpit and the other is in the rear of the cockpit. This arrangement is in fact believed to be the unique novel teaching of the Bollard.

Therefore, altering this arrangement would go against the teachings of Bollard and cannot be done. Bollard, claim 1; and col. 4, lines 21-26. Accordingly, the rejections with respect to claims 14-20 and 25 are not sustainable and should be withdrawn along with an indication of allowance for these rejected claims.

With respect to claim 22, this claim depends from claim 21 and is therefore allowable based on the remarks above presented for claim 21.

Conclusion

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicants' attorney (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743.

Respectfully submitted,

DALE R. LANGNER ET AL.

By their Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(612) 373-6960

Date 8/7/03

By _____
Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 7 day of August, 2003.

Candis B. Buending
Name

_____
Signature